

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to FIG. 1. This sheet, which includes FIGS. 1-2, replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 1-2.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the attached replacement sheet of drawings and following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 13 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 7 are independent claims.

**Priority Documents**

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner acknowledge the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) has received certified copies of all the priority documents in the next Official Communication issued by the USPTO.

**Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that the references included in the Information Disclosure Statements filed December 2, 2005 and February 6, 2006 have been acknowledged as considered.

**Drawings**

The drawings are objected to because the boxes are not labeled with functional names. As shown in the attached replacement sheet, FIG. 1 is amended to include labels for the boxes. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5-9 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Ubelein et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,515,377, herein Ubelein). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as detailed below.

In particular the Examiner asserts “UBELEIN discloses a circuit and a process are used to control operation of an electromagnetic drive arrangement wherein switching device (S1) and switching device (S2) arranged in a serial configuration are actuated together or with a time offset (col. 5, lines 1-8).” However, the cited portion of Ubelein merely states that “[i]f multiple relays are provided to supply current to the electrical mechanical drive arrangement, the respective connections are actuated together or with the time offset.” There is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Ubelein that the two switches S1 and S2 are controlled via separate control devices. Because separate control devices are not disclosed or taught by Ubelein, Ubelein also fails to disclose, teach or suggest separate control devices functioning according to a master/slave principle.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Ubelein fails to disclose all the features of independent claims 1 and 7. In particular, Applicants respectfully submit that Ubelein at least fails to disclose, teach or suggest “the first switch in the switching device is drivable by the first control device and the second switch in the switching device is drivable by the second control device, ..., the first and the second control device operate on the master/slave principle,” as recited in claim 1. Similarly, Ubelein at least fails to disclose, teach or suggest “emitting a first drive signal from the first control device to the first switch in the switching device on the basis of the input signal; and emitting a second drive signal from the second control device to the second switch in the switching device on the basis of the input signal, ..., and wherein the first and the second drive signal are produced using a master/slave process as a function of the input signal,” as recited in independent

claim 7.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejections of independent claims 1 and 7, and the claims depending therefrom, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Further, if the Examiner chooses to maintain this rejection, Applicant requests that the Examiner identify portions of Ubelein that are believed to disclose the above-emphasized features of independent claims 1 and 7.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ubelein in view of Russell et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,665,323, herein Russell). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as detailed below.

Applicant's review of Russell indicates that Russell fails to cure the deficiencies of Ubelein described above with respect to independent claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, even if Ubelein and Russell are combinable (which Applicant does not admit), claim 4 is allowable over the proposed combination of Ubelein and Russell for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable over Ubelein.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-9 and 13 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Donald J. Daley at the telephone number of the undersigned below.


If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By

 55,149  
Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

 55,149  
Scott A. Elchert, Reg. No. 55,149

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000

DJD/SAE/ame